

## **REMARKS**

In the above application with claims 58-75 previously pending, with this amendment claims 58-75 have been cancelled, and new claims 76-89 have been added.

### **Section 103 Rejection**

Claims 58-75 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant's admitted prior art in Figs. 1A-1B (hereafter "APA") in view of Grabbe et al. (US 5,152,695, hereafter "Grabbe") and further in view of Mathieu et al. (US 6,68,015, hereafter "Mathieu"). Claims 58-75 have been cancelled rendering this rejection moot with respect to those claims.

Newly added claims 76-89 are believed allowable over "APA" in view of Grabbe et al. and further in view of Mathieu et al. In particular, the Office Action states that APA discloses all of the claimed invention except for the width of the beam portion decreasing along the length from the base to the tip portion, the tip portion comprising a beveled peripheral edge. The Office Action continues stating, however, that Grabbe discloses a contact structure comprising a tapered beam portion having a width decreasing along a length of the beam portion from a base [38] to a tip [34]. The Office Action indicates it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to modify the structure of APA to provide the tapered beam portion as taught by Grabbe in order to provide a substantially constant deflection and stresses along the beam.

In contrast however, no motive is believed provided for combining the tapered beam with Grabbe with APA. Neither Grabbe nor APA indicate that tapering

the beam will provide a substantially constant deflection and stress along the beam. Further, this is not necessarily a result of combining Grabbe and APA. Grabbe cuts a metal structure that simply appears to end up with a triangular shape based on how two contacts are cut from one square conductive plate, and provides no other reason for using such a shape. APA does not cut a square plate to form two beams. The only reason for combining Grabbe and APA, thus, appears to be taught by applicant's disclosure, which is improper hindsight.

Regarding new independent claims 76 and 84, neither APA, Grabbe, nor Mathieu teach forming a recess region for a tapered beam, and depositing the conductive material in the recess to form the beam.

Further, regarding new independent claims 82 and 86, APA Grabbe, nor Nathieu disclose forming the recess region by stamping.

Further none of APA, Grabbe, or Mathieu disclose a stop structure as now claimed in claims 78, 80 and 85.

## Conclusion

In light of the above amendments and remarks, claims 76-89 are now all believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 30, 2006

By: Thomas A. Ward  
Thomas A. Ward  
Reg. No. 35,732

FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-4156  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800